



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,968	08/15/2006	Jozef Pieter Van Gassel	NL040164	8738
24737	7590	12/16/2010	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			NGUYEN, DUC M	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2618	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
12/16/2010	PAPER			

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/597,968	VAN GASSEL ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	DUC M. NGUYEN	2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2010.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to applicant's response filed on 10/12/10. Claims 1-15 are now pending in the present application. **This action is made final.**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said storage means" in line 11 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

As to claim 1, the previous Office Action would interpret "the local storage means" as the serving antecedent basis for "said storage means". However, the newly added limitation "allocating at least part of the storage means for local access by the local storage means" and the argument as argued by Applicant in page 7 of the "Remark" regarding "By allocating data between at least two storage devices" would imply that there are **two** storage devices. Therefore, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "said storage means" in line 11 of the claim.

4. Claim 12 recites the limitation "said storage means" in line 13 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Here, it is not clear whether the “storage means” as recited in claim 1 or “a storage means” as recited in line 10 of claim 12 would serve as antecedent basis for the limitation “said storage means” in line 13 of the claim 12.

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 1 and 12 recites the limitation ““allocating at least part of the storage means for local access by the local storage means” and the argument as argued by Applicant in page 7 of the "Remark" would imply that there are **two** storage devices. However, Fig. 1 shows only one local storage means 11 for the portable rendering device 1. Since there is only one local storage means for the portable rendering device 1, the limitation ““allocating at least part of the storage means for local access by the local storage means” contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Note that the storage means 12 of the stand in Fig. 1 does not represent a storage means of the portable rendering device or the “internal storage means” as described in paragraph [0014]

[0014] Hence, by allocating a part or the entire storage area of the internal storage means for local access within the rendering device, the limitations of the prior art are overcome. Moreover, such smart synchronization strategy enhances the user experience by a high quality of the played-back video in combination with extended battery life, as energy consumption is reduced and disturbances of wireless communications are avoided. Therefore, the user does no longer have to rely on the bandwidth and quality of the wireless link, when the screen is detached from the stand. This also saves precious bandwidth for other devices. Experiments of the inventors have verified that the power consumption of retrieving data from a local storage device is an order of magnitude lower than sending it over WiFi, confirming the above. Thus a lot of energy can be saved by caching data on a local storage device, leading to the extended battery life. In addition, the battery of the display is charged when the device is in the stand. A further advantage is that the device does not need to stay in reach of a base station, e.g. integrated into the stand, and is thus truly mobile. This means that the user may e.g. take the device into the car and finish watching a film in the car.

Applicant is hereby requested to clearly explain the limitation regarding the “storage means” and “local storage means” in relation to Fig. 1 so that a proper interpretation of the claimed limitation can be made and put on the record.

In the rejection below, the “storage means” would be interpreted as the same “local storage means”. The “internal storage means” as recited in [0014] would also be interpreted as the “local storage means” 11 in Fig. 1, where this “internal storage means” or “local storage means” would store many datum, and part of its memory are allocated to store “image data” for local access by the display device.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC □ 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims **1-6, 8-12, 14-15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Liew** et al (US 2003/0167337) in view of **Moriyama** et al (US 2004/0198430).

Regarding claims **1**, **Liew** discloses a method of saving power for a mobile rendering device, said method comprising the steps of:

when said rendering device is connected to a wired network:

a) downloading data via said wired network at a maximum available data rate, wherein said data being to be rendered on said mobile rendering device (see [0013, 0034, 0038]),

b) storing said data on a local storage means of said mobile rendering device (see [0017, 0038]),

c) rendering the received data from said local storage means for reproduction by said mobile rendering device (see [[0019, 0037, 0040]]; and

when said rendering device subsequently is not connected to any network:

d) rendering said stored data from said storage means on said display means (see [0024, 0040]); such that data transmission via a wireless network connection of said mobile rendering device is avoided when possible by allocating at least part of the storage means for local access by the local storage means as claimed (see [0024, 0040]), where it is clear that when the download is completed, the client would not be connected to any network (see [0024]), and that the download data would be stored in at least part of memory of the storage means allocated for storing the downloaded data for local access by the display device.

or if the client is connected solely to a wireless network in the similar way as disclosed by **Moriyama** (see Figs. 1, 3, 5), data transmission via a wireless would be unnecessary because the download has been completed.

Therefore, by simply providing a wireless capability to the client in Liew, the claimed limitations are made obvious by Liew and Moriyama.

Regarding claim 2, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. However, **Liew** fails to teach continue downloading said data (i.e., not yet downloaded data) via a wireless connection. However, **Moriyama** further teaches a method for downloading image data via a wired and wireless connection, where downloading of image data via a wireless connection is continued after disconnected from a wired connection (see Figs. 6, 9). Since it would have been obvious to continue download data if not completed (see Liew, [0039]), it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Liew to continue

downloading said data via a wireless connection as suggested by Moriyama, in order to finish an assigned task before continue to a next one (see Liew, [0038-0039]).

Regarding claim 3, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 2 above. In addition, **Liew** as modified would teach the step of switching off said wireless network connection upon finishing downloading said data to said local storage means (see Liew,[0024]), wherein said data comprises remaining data of a content to be rendered from said local storage means as claimed (see Moriyama, Figs. 6, 9).

Regarding claim 4, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Liew** would teach the step of requesting said data to be received, wherein said requesting being based upon user interaction (see Liew, [0032] regarding scheduling unit 118 which would obviously suggest a user interaction with the scheduling unit).

Regarding claim 5, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Liew** would teach the step of requesting said data to be received, wherein said requesting being based upon predetermined user preferences (see Liew, [0032] regarding scheduling unit 118 which would obviously suggest a user preference with the scheduling unit).

Regarding claim 6, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Liew** to provide the step of indicating the status of the downloaded data as claimed, for notifying a user when download are completed (see Liew, [0024]).

Regarding claim **8**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Liew** would teach said data being multimedia content as claimed (see [0015]).

Regarding claim **9**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, Liew would teach performing the transition from step c) to step d) without interruption as claimed (see Liew, [0019]).

Regarding claim **10**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, Liew would teach performing step c) simultaneously to steps a) and b) as claimed (see Liew, [0019]).

Regarding claim **11**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Liew** as modified would teach the mobile rendering device is positioned in a fixed location when connected to the wired network; and used in a mobile environment when solely connected to the wireless network or not connected to any network at all (see Moriyama, Fig. 1 ).

Regarding claim **12**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, Liew as modified would teach a mobile rendering device (1) for performing the method of claim 1, said device (1) comprising means (10) for reproducing data (see Liew, [0019]); wireless network communication means (17) (see Moriyama, Figs. 3, 5), and wired network communication means (15) (see Moriyama, Figs. 3, 5), said means (10, 15, 17) being operatively connected to each other such that said device is adapted to receiving data via either a wireless network in a mobile

environment, or via a wired network at a fixed location (see Moriyama, Figs. 3, 5), from a remote data server for rendering on said display means (10) (see Liew, [0015]),

    said device (1) further comprising a storage means (11) for storing data received from said data server via said wired network (15) or via said wireless network (15), wherein received data in use is rendered on said means for reproducing data from data read from said storage means (11) at said fixed location and in said mobile environment (see Liew, [0017] and Moriyama, Figs. 3, 5).

    Regarding claim 14, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 12 above. In addition, Liew as modified would teach said fixed location is a stand (12) for releasably receiving said device (1) as claimed (see Moriyama, Figs. 1, 3, 6).

    Regarding claim 15, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 12 above. In addition, Liew would obviously teach said device is a portable flat panel television set as claimed (see Liew, [0002]).

9.    Claims 7, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Liew** in view of **Moriyama**, and further in view of **Matthews** et al (US 2002/0109665).

    Regarding claims 7, 13, since **Liew** as modified in view of **Moriyama** would obviously teach a battery for the portable client in a wireless mode (see Moriyama, Fig. 1, 3, 5). Therefore, in order to provide a power supply for the client to operate, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Liew to provide a docking to recharge the battery in the similar as disclosed by **Matthews** (see [0017]), in order to provide a power supply for the client to operate.

10. Claims 1, 4-6, 8-12, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Wong** (US 7,739,597) in view of **Liew** et al (US 2003/0167337).

Regarding claim 1, **Wong** discloses a method of saving power for a mobile rendering device, said method comprising the steps of:

when said rendering device is connected to a wired network:

a) downloading data via said wired network at a maximum available data rate, wherein said data being to be rendered on said mobile rendering device (see col. 14, lines 41-57 regarding hard wired connection), where **Wong** would obviously suggest the download is performed at maximum available rate (see col. 8, lines 39-41) in the similar way as disclosed by **Liew** (see [0019]);

b) storing said data on a local storage means of said mobile rendering device (see col. 10, lines 50-56),

c) rendering the received data from said local storage means for reproduction by said mobile rendering device (see col. 10, lines 50-56), which can be viewed while downloading in the similar way as disclosed by **Liew** (see [0019]); and

when said rendering device subsequently is solely connected to a wireless network or not connected to any network:

d) rendering said stored data from said storage means on said display means (see col. 10, lines 50-56);

such that data transmission via a wireless network connection of said mobile rendering device is avoided when possible by allocating at least part of the storage

means for local access by the local storage means as claimed (see Wong, col. 10, lines 50-56 and Liew, [0024, 0040]), where it is clear that when the download is completed, the IMF client would not be connected to any network and thus, data transmission via a wireless network would be unnecessary., and that the download data would be stored in at least part of memory of the storage means allocated for storing the downloaded data for local access by the display device.

Regarding claim 4, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Wong** would teach the step of requesting said data to be received, wherein said requesting being based upon user interaction (see Wong, col. 14, lines 47-57).

Regarding claim 5, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Wong** would teach the step of requesting said data to be received, wherein said requesting being based upon predetermined user preferences (see Wong, col. 14, lines 47-57).

Regarding claim 6, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Wong** would teach the step of indicating the status of the downloaded data as claimed (see col. 8, lines 18-25).

Regarding claim 8, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Wong** would teach said data being multimedia content as claimed (see Wong, col. 5, lines 25-31).

Regarding claim **9**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Wong** as modified in view of Liew would teach performing the transition from step c) to step d) without interruption as claimed (see Liew, [0019]).

Regarding claim **10**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Wong** as modified in view of Liew would teach performing step c) simultaneously to steps a) and b) as claimed (see Liew, [0019]).

Regarding claim **11**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Wong** would teach the mobile rendering device is positioned in a fixed location when connected to the wired network; and used in a mobile environment when solely connected to the wireless network or not connected to any network at all (see Wong,col. 12, lines 47-58) .

11. Claims **2-3, 12, 14-15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Wong** in view of **Liew** and further in view of **Moriyama** et al (US 2004/0198430).

Regarding claim **2**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, Wong would teach downloading data via a wireless connection at a maximum available data rate of said wireless network connection to said storage means as claimed (see col. 8, lines 37-44). However, **Wong** fails to explicitly teach continue downloading said data via a wireless connection. However, **Moriyama** teaches a method for downloading image data via a wired and wireless connection (see Fig. 6), where downloading of image data via a wireless connection is continued after disconnected from a wired connection (see Fig. 9). Since it would have been obvious to

continue download data if the transfer has not been completed (see Liew, [0039]), it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wong to continue downloading said data via a wireless connection as suggested by Moriyama, in order to finish an assigned task before continue to a next one (see Liew, [0038-0039]).

Regarding claim **3**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 2 above. In addition, **Wong** as modified would teach the step of switching off said wireless network connection upon finishing downloading said data to said local storage means (see Liew,[0024] and Wong, col. 10, lines 50-56), wherein said data comprises remaining data of a content to be rendered from said local storage means (see Moriyama, Fig. 9).

Regarding claim **12**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, Wong as modified would teach a mobile rendering device (1) for performing the method of claim 1, said device (1) comprising means (10) for reproducing data (see Wong, col. 10, lines 50-56, and Liew, [0019]);

wireless network communication means (17) (see Wong, col. 12, lines 57-58 and Moriyama, Figs. 3, 5), and

wired network communication means (15) (see Wong, col. 12, lines 57-58 and Moriyama, Figs. 3, 5),

said means (10, 15, 17) being operatively connected to each other such that said device is adapted to receiving data via either a wireless network in a mobile

environment, or via a wired network at a fixed location (see Wong, col. 12, lines 57-58 and Moriyama, Figs. 6, 9), from a remote data server for rendering on said display means (10) (see Wong, col. 14, lines 41-57),

    said device (1) further comprising a storage means (11) for storing data received from said data server via said wired network (15) or via said wireless network (15), wherein received data in use is rendered on said means for reproducing data from data read from said storage means (11) at said fixed location and in said mobile environment (see Wong, col. 10, lines 50-56 and Moriyama, Figs. 3, 5, 6, 9).

    Regarding claim **14**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 12 above. In addition, Wong as modified would teach said fixed location is a stand (12) for releasably receiving said device (1) (see Moriyama, Figs. 1, 3).

    Regarding claim **15**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 12 above. In addition, Wong as modified would teach said device is a portable flat panel television set (see Wong, Fig. 9).

12.    Claim **7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Wong** in view of **Liew** and further in view of **Matthews** et al (US 2002/0109665).

    Regarding claim **7**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, since Wong would obviously teach a battery for the portable IMF in a wireless mode in order to provide a power supply for the IMF to operate (see col. 8, lines 62-66), it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wong to provide a docking to recharge the battery in the

similar as disclosed by **Matthews** (see [0017]), in order to provide a power supply for the IMF to operate.

13. Claim **13** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Wong** in view of **Liew** and **Moriyama**, and further in view of **Matthews** et al (US 2002/0109665).

Regarding claim **13**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 12 above. In addition, , since Wong would obviously teach a battery for the portable IMF in a wireless mode in order to provide a power supply for the IMF to operate (see col. 8, lines 62-66), it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wong to provide a docking to recharge the battery in the similar as disclosed by **Matthews** (see [0017]), in order to provide a power supply for the IMF to operate.

### ***Response to Arguments***

14. Applicant's arguments filed 10/12/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the Remark, Applicant contends that

Claim 1, as amended herein, recites, *inter alia*, as follows:

"...by allocating at least part of the storage means for local access by the local storage means..." (Emphasis added.)

Neither Liew, nor Moriyama, taken alone or in any proper combination, teach and/or suggest at least the added feature(s) of amended independent Claim 1.

And .....

At paragraph [0014] of Applicant's published application (2008/0151130), it is stated that:

**"Hence, by allocating a part or the entire storage area of the internal storage means for local access within the rendering device,** the limitations of the prior art are overcome. Moreover, such smart synchronization strategy enhances the user experience by a high quality of the played-back video in combination with extended battery life, as energy consumption is reduced and disturbances of wireless communications are avoided. Therefore, the user does no longer have to rely on the bandwidth and quality of the wireless link, when the screen is detached from the stand. This also saves precious bandwidth for other devices." (Emphasis added.)

As recited in the Claims, data is allocated between at least two storage areas, one of them being a local storage area within the portable device. By allocating data between at least two storage devices, power consumption may be reduced and power savings may be realized.

In response, the examiner asserts that the argument in that "data is allocated between at least two storage areas, one of them being a local storage area within the portable device. By allocating data between at least two storage devices, power consumption may be reduced and power savings may be realized" is not supported by the specification. Specifically, the "allocating data between at least two storage devices" is not supported by the specification.

However, regarding the obviousness of the claimed invention with respect to the cited prior art, as stated in the specification, the claimed invention is an improvement over the prior art described in the background of the invention, where the described prior art does not teach a local storage for storing data which is downloaded at a high speed. The improvement over the described prior art comprises providing of a local storage for storing data which is downloaded at a maximum available speed when connected to a wired network. However, this improvement has been taught by cited prior art such as Liew (US 2003/0167337), where Liew teaches a device with a local storage for storing data which is downloaded at a maximum available speed when connected to a wired network (see [0019]). Note here that the wireless connection of a

device is just an added capability of the device and does not have any connection to the improvement of “storing data which is downloaded at a maximum available speed when connected a wired network”.

Therefore, by simply providing Liew’s teaching to a wired/wireless device in cited prior art or providing an added wireless capacity of Liew’s device, the improvement would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made.

For foregoing reasons, the examiner believes that the pending claims are not allowable over the cited prior art.

### ***Conclusion***

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

16. **Any response to this final action should be mailed to:**

Box A.F.  
Commissioner of Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**or faxed to:**

(571) 273-8300 (for **formal** communications intended for entry)

(571)-273-7893 (for informal or **draft** communications).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Customer Service Window,  
Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or communications from the examiner  
should be directed to Duc M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7893,  
Monday-Thursday (9:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

Or to Nay Maung (Supervisor) whose telephone number is (571) 272-7882.

/Duc M. Nguyen/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618

Dec 9, 2010